REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-9 are pending in the application. In response to the

January 27, 2005 Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define

patentable subject matter.

The title is objected to because the Examiner asserts that it does not accurately describe

the claimed invention. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the title. Accordingly, the

Examiner is requested to remove the objection to the title.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

because the Examiner asserts that in claim 5, line 4, it is not clear as to which nodes are being

referred in the phrase "the required number of nodes B". By this Amendment, Applicant has

amended the claims to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the §

112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickness et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,803; hereafter "Bickness") in view of Aho et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,198,941; hereafter "Aho"). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Bickness discloses all of

the features of the claimed invention except for "processing packets in a radio network".

However, the Examiner cites Aho (col. 4, lines 45-56 and Fig. 1) for allegedly disclosing that

"[t]he use of multi-protocol stacks for processing radio packets is well know in the art" and

asserts that it would have been obvious ... to utilize Bicknell's distributed protocol stacks in such

radio networks because it would have enabled processing multi-protocol packets more efficiently."

With reference to Figs. 1 and 2, Bickness discloses a distributed processing system 100 includes a protocol server 101 that enables a plurality of client processors 103-104 to share the use of one set of Signaling System 7 (SS7) links 99, that centralizes the link-termination circuitry 110 for use by the client processors 103-104, and provides access to upper layers 215-219 of the SS7 protocol stack 200 by distributing the processing of different layers of the stack between the protocol server 101 and the client processors 103-104. The protocol server 101 terminates the lower layers 210-213 of the SS7 protocol, while each client processor 103-104 terminates the upper layers 215-219 of the SS7 protocol. Communication between the protocol server 101 and the client processors 103-104 of information expressed in the upper layers 215-219 of the SS7 protocol is effected via the TCP/IP protocol over a LAN 102. A service access bridge process 113, 116 in the protocol server 101 translates between the lower layers 210-213 of the SS7 protocol and the TCP/IP protocol, and a distributed signaling server process 114, 117 in the protocol server 101 routes communications across the LAN 102. A distributed signaling client process 121, 124 in each client translates between the TCP/IP protocol and the upper layers 215-219 of the SS7 protocol.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been rendered obvious in view of Bickness and Aho. In particular, neither Bickness nor Aho disclose allocating a plurality of protocol stacks (assigned to different network component interfaces) to a plurality of different multiprocessor units comprising a plurality of processor groups having a

plurality of individual processors. Further, the cited references do not disclose the precise

allocation to an individual processor takes place as a function of which protocol stack the

individual protocols belong to and which layer within the protocol stack the protocols belong to.

Instead, Bicknell discloses distributing the processing of different layers of a protocol stack

between the protocol server and the client processors (i.e., Bicknell provides no disclosure of

multiple processor groups or multiple protocol stacks assigned to different network component

interfaces). Aho simply discloses a processor that includes a multilayer protocol stack.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as well as

dependent claims 2-7, should be allowable because the combined references do not teach or

suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 8 and 9 to improve clarity and recite

features similar to those in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8

and 9 should be allowable over the combined references for the same reasons set forth above

with regard to claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

Date: April 27, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q65832